Dear Commandante,

We hope that you have had a very Blessed and Merry Christmas. I trust that you will forgive me for two things: first for taking so long in responding to your comments concerning the "baptism of desire," and second for writing to you in English. Since I am more than pressed at the time with many duties and also since the points I wish to elucidate for you can be more speedily and accurately written in my own language, I am sure you will be patient enough to labor through a translation. Do feel free to answer in Italian as it is not as difficult for me to read your language as it is to write it.

I was delighted to hear that our friend, [redacted] found time to visit with you. He was very happy about the discussion he had with you. In fact, it was he who reminded me that you are still awaiting a reply to your letter of last August.

A good part of the reason you have not heard from me is that we have just recovered from an unexpected dislocation of our religious community. The newsletters I sent you (which I hope you have received) tell the story. You see, like Monsignor Lefebrve, we had a division in our ranks, only we happened to be the minority. This led recently to a court-ordered eviction of our group from our own monastery. So, you may begin to understand why I have been negligent. Things are quietly returning to normalcy now and, blessed with some new vocations, we are more desirous than ever to relaunch our crusade with even greater vigor.

I still have the Portuguese-languauge manuscript that you were so kind to send me pertaining to your lights on the Secret of Fatima. I am going to give this in the next few days to someone to translate. We also have received in French the opus of Frere Michel. My superior Brother Francis, who does read French, is very enthused about the tremendous discoveries of this hard-working author.

I am hoping that by the time you receive my letter you will have read the Bread of Life and the Gate of Heaven, and the Loyolas & Cabots as well. The books I sent will help you very much in understanding our position on the "baptism of desire."

Then too, I am more than curious to know if you were the person who was interviewed recently in the Angelus by a priest in Rome from the Society of St. Pius X. The information was very disconcerting, though not too surprising. "By their fruits you shall know them." However, I did feel that the footnote remarks by Father Laisnez were overdone and somewhat condescending. A brief note explaining appreciation minus 100 percent agreement in fact or policy would have sufficed.

In an English-language conservative publication called Ave Maria, an author wrote that Cardinal Ratzinger and the Pope are quite at odds over basic policy. In fact, he alleged that the Cardinal offered his resignation after the Holy Father de-fused his criticisms of liberation theology. After reading the comments of the Roman interviewee in the Angelus, this sounds like it could be true. Can you verify it?

Before getting down to dogmatic matters, I do have an enormous favor to ask of you. A year or so ago, we asked our mutual friend, the valiant Hamish Fraser, to write a commentary for our magazine From the Housetops on current affairs vis-a-vis Rome and the goings on in the Church. Such a commentary will be more needed now that Hamish has been called to his eternal rest. It need be written only four times a year, and it need only fill a maximum of eight Housetop's pages. I think each page

of the magazine contains about 500 words. Of course even a minimal four pages would be valuable reading. Excuse our importunity for proposing this to you. We are confident in your views and sense a kindred spirit. If you prefer to write in Italian, I can translate it in the literal sense for you. We would have to reserve the right, if there was an absolute need for it, to edit. Also we would send you some little compensation if you choose to meet our request. Anyway, you may have an easier time making up your mind after you study our doctrinal issue more thoroughly. The following lengthy explanation focusing on Baptism will help you, I pray.

I should say at the start that I am in process of preparing a book on the entire issue of No Salvation Outside the Church. A chapter, much more detailed and with more pressing arguments than you will read below, will be found in the book. The following is being written prematurely and hastily — the work of only three days — so please do not let any minor mistakes obscure your vision of the major issue. If the devil had not succeeded most adeptly in beclouding this aspect of the dogma, it would hardly be difficult to defend. However, God for His own good purposes has allowed a great deal of confusion to proliferate on the doctrine of Baptism's necessity, and the Church Herself has allowed the controversy to rage these past two centuries, with no definitive voice settling the issue from the Chair. In previous centuries, there was much more diligence, I believe, in safeguarding the salvation doctrine. In fact, the highest authority in the Church today seems bent on abetting the confusion with incredible disregard for both orthodoxy and orthopraxy.

To begin, the de fide doctrine must be premised that "supernatural faith", true faith, is necessary for obtaining the life of grace the Church calls "justification." This is clearly the doctrine communicated to the Church by Christ Our Savior in the Gospels, by Saint Paul in his epistles, and by so many Popes and Councils, preeminently the Holy Council of Trent. One can even find the same dogmatic truth carefully placed at the end of that unfortunate 1949 letter of the Holy Office to Cardinal Cushing of Boston concerning the case of Father Feeney and Saint Benedict Center. Note must be made at once that this letter was never promulgated as an official "Act" of the Apostolic See, for it never appeared in the Acta, and, consequently, ought not to have appeared in Denzinger's collection of official Acts. As all the Jesuits know, or should know, this document was slipped into Denzinger by Karl Rahner, who knew exactly what mischief he was up to. The only known Latin source for this document (that our antagonists like to cite as the Suprema Haec Sacra) appeared in the American Ecclesiastical Review. Several authors have commented upon these mysterious points without perceiving their implication. (Father Maurice Eminyan, S.J., The Theology of Salvation & Monsignor Joseph C. Fenton, The Catholic Church and Salvation) I might add that even Vatican II's Lumen Gentium repeats the same doctrinal truth concerning the necessity of supernatural faith for justification.

The Council of Trent defines justification as "being a translation from that state wherein man is born a child of the first Adam to the state of grace and of adoption of the sons of God through the second Adam, Jesus Christ, our Savior. And this translation, since the promulgation of the Gospel, cannot be effected without the laver of regeneration or the desire thereof, as it is written: 'Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' (John 3:5)" And further, "Now they (adults) are disposed unto the said justice, when, excited or assisted by divine grace, conceiving faith by hearing (my emphasis), they are freely moved towards God, believing those things to be true which God has revealed and promised — and this especially, that God justifies the impious by His grace through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ, and . . . lastly, when they purpose to receive baptism, to begin a new life, and to keep the commandments of God."

Among other pronouncements, the Athanasian Creed stands out foremost in its uncompromising insistence that the Catholic Faith, divine Faith, cannot be held except "integrally." That is, by the denial of any one doctrine, all faith is lost, for the virtue of Faith, which is God's act in us as well as our own, is not a revelation of "flesh and blood" but of God, hence it is not deduced from human science, but by the authority of God Himself revealing and the Church teaching. It is in this act of submission to Divine Authority, as it was made known to men of Old by the prophets and the tradition of the Ancients, and to men of the New Dispensation by the teaching of Christ's Church, that the virtue of Faith consists. This objective knowledge which comprises the matter of Faith may be ever so minimal or quite detailed, but the assent of the will to what is known is entire not partial, such that all that the Church teaches is accepted in childlike simplicity. That is to say, truths objectively known are embraced on the same authority as the truths not as yet known, which are implicit so to speak, or inchoative, in those that are known. For example, as we see in the annals of so many missionary tales, a priest (or, as has been other times recorded, a lay believer) comes upon a dying man desirous of Faith but still laboring in the darkness of ignorance. The preacher may have only time to recite to him the Creed, or perhaps merely the essential truth of the Mystery of the Incarnation and Redemption, and if the grace offered by God is accepted, such a one can be baptized at once, for in these few foundational truths all the Faith is contained. Saint Thomas explicitly teaches this in the Summa, as every knowledgeable priest knows. Yet, we still find them picking apart this great doctor, quoting out of context the saint's responses to objections that only indirectly treat of the subject at hand, and using this or that apparently self-serving citation to the complete disregard of the more direct treatises where he is addressing the specific subject at hand. If ever there was a book that has to be taken in its totality, it is the Summa Theologica of Saint Thomas. Sometimes, I wonder if some of our antagonists have ever read the Summa thoroughly. I know of not a few who open it only to search for a quote in order to back up some view of theirs. To educate themselves, they use it not. To educate others with their own opinions, they use it. Of course, I am not saying everyone who attacks our position is of this type. On the necessary minimal amount of objective content for the saving act of Faith, the Dominican doctor says this:

> Moreover implicit faith is not enough, nor is it possible to have implicit faith in some truth if one does not hold explicitly other truths. (Summa T, Pt. II-II, q. 2. A.5)
>
> Therefore, as regards the primary points or articles of faith, man must believe them explicitly, just as he must have faith. (same as above)
>
> After the Incarnation, all men if they wish to be saved . . . are bound to explicit faith in the mysteries of Christ, chiefly as regards those which are observed throughout the Church and publicly proclaimed, such as the articles that refer to the Incarnation. . . And, after the Incarnation, all men in order to be saved . . . are bound to explicit faith in the mystery of the Trinity. (Summa, Op. Cit. Art. 7 & 8)

In view of the authorities I have cited, a Catholic would be surely perverse to hold that the freely-given virtue of supernatural faith can be implanted by God in a soul devoid of any knowledge of its own sinfulness and need for the Redeemer that has come into this world, or worse still that such divine faith can reside in the soul of one who is entangled in the net of false religion, heresy, and idolatry. And without

this divinely supernatural faith there is no remission of sin and elevation to state of children of God.

Now after the age of the Catacombs, a question arose as to the possibility of salvation for a catechumen who died prior to his reception of the sacrament of Baptism. Some saints argued that in such a one the desire of the sacrament, since it can justify if charity is ardent, would suffice for the absence of a minister and water. Other saints said no to this, preferring not to rationalize. They stressed that Christ has not revealed it; therefore, no water, no salvation. The controversy lingered for many centuries right down to our own where the more liberal opinion has changed substantially and become outright heresy. In the writings of two Fathers, Sts. Ambrose and Augustine (who, for the comfort of catechumens in a time when the sentence of death could fall unexpectedly upon a convert to Christianity, assured their flocks that the shedding of their blood would be accepted as surely as the pouring of water) inconsistencies will be found on this particular point. At one time, although I am not prepared at this time to posit fixed dates, Saint Ambrose argued that catechumens are definitely not members of the Church, are as yet outside the way of salvation, and are without grace. Then, during his funeral oration for the Emperor Valentinian, he said that the desire of the illustrious catechumen would be acceptable before God for the deed. I have found as yet no quotation prior to Saint Ambrose advocating this theory, although Saint Thomas found a basis for it in Saint Cyprian of Carthage who preceeded Ambrose by a century. Therefore, I am assuming that the opinion gained precedence due to the high prestige the Italian Doctor enjoyed, showing up again in the writings of his disciple Saint Augustine and again in the latter's disciple, Saint Fulgentius. The view grew to be quite common in the West, although not in the East. Hear Saint Ambrose in one of his other orations:

> Nor again is the mystery of regeneration without water; for 'unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' Now a catechumen also believes in the Cross of Our Lord Jesus Christ, by which he also signs himself, but unless he be baptized in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost he cannot receive remission of his sins, nor can he receive the gift of spiritual grace.
> (De Mysteriis, Chapter IV, n. 20)

Saint Ambrose, who as you know (for reasons not to be commended) postponed his own baptism into mid-life, was not totally correct in this overly strict view. Catechumens certainly could be placed anticipationally in the state of grace, hence gaining treasure in heaven by their prayers and good works, which treasure could not be enhanced if they were not in grace. The Council of Trent defined this truth as part of the sacred deposit. And the Acts of the Apostles explicitly teach the same truth in the case of Cornelius. The only thing I can bring to light about Saint Ambrose's oration about the Emperor is to call to mind just whose funeral it was -- an Emperor's! All he could say on such an occasion was simply, "Let us hope for the best!" True, the saint did not believe, at least from what his words indicate, that anyone had baptized Valentinian; perhaps too, he spoke this way because the solemn baptism was the one the Church officially recognized. Finally, a funeral oration for a Roman Emperor is not the place to illustrate the most challenging of dogmas. Protocol was in order. The saint may have considered the view he expressed as at least tenable, that is, not heretical, and he might have adopted it for the occasion as a kind of polite

compromise without intending that it should be taken as his final word on the subject. Moreover, if the common faith of the ecclesia discens (the Church learning), which is in a sense infallible, was that the desire for the sacrament was enough to insure salvation, then why did Saint Ambrose bother to comfort the faithful listening to him? Obviously, the believing Church considered water as necessary for all or they would not have been distraught over the supposed misfortune of their Emperor. Then, too, we can see that the Valentinian oration differs in substance from the above theological teaching enunciated by the same saint when he was free from restraining pressures. Nevertheless, I find it incredible that Valentinian did not ask someone in the cohort all around him to baptize him, and, even if he was too delirious to ask, there were enough Christians among his troops who were aware that he was a catechumen and who would have hastened to perform the rite themselves as they were instructed to do in such emergencies. Moreover, Father Migne, the celebrated Patrologist, taking into account the holy bishop's consistent teaching on the subject, objected to the accrediting of the baptism of desire to Ambrose, because he found it to be contradictory to the doctor's many related discourses. (Reference appended on final page)

Saint Augustine, as well, seemed to hold two different views on the subject, although in his later Retractions the less strict view seems the more evident. At one time, Augustine taught that in the case of a catechumen like Valentinian (and I might add, like Saint Ambrose himself), if the believer presumptuosly puts off his new life in baptism hoping to escape Purgatory and fly to heaven in the 11th hour, a sudden death was a sign of God's displeasure and the man's reprobation. The African doctor held other extreme views in his war against the Pelagians that no one would have held from the time of Saint Thomas on. Concerning unbaptized children, he held there can be no pain of loss without some very minimal pain of sense owed to the effects of original sin — which are manifest even in infants. Of course, this opinion was rejected, but the great saint was never called a heretic for holding it. One of the best studies of Saint Augustine is found in the biography of the saint by Father Van der Meer who presents for his readers another view of the doctor overlooked by the baptism of desire protagonists. Allow me to highlight his analysis:

> This whole evil (a catechumen delaying his baptism) was one with which Augustine never wearied in doing battle. Even the anniversary of his consecration found him in a fighting mood:
>
> "I care naught," he cried out on this occasion, "that today of all days you expect to hear something pleasant from me. I must warn you in the words of Holy Scripture: 'Defer it not from day to day, for his wrath shall come on a sudden.' God knows that I tremble in my cathedra myself when I hear those words. I must not, I cannot, be silent. I am compelled to preach to you on this matter and to make you fearful, being myself full of fear. . . . How dangerous is every delay! How many rascals are saved by being baptized on their death-beds? And how many earnest catechumens die unbaptized?"
>
> — which, for Augustine is equivalent to saying they are lost forever. He compares the carefree condition of mind that such people often display with the dread sleeping-sickness of an old man, who keeps on saying, 'Let me sleep,' although the doctor keeps warning those around him that sleep is the one thing he must not do:

> "And do you make it a reproach to me," he continues, "that I disturb your peace of mind. How can I comfort you when the threat comes from God Himself? For I am but the steward, not the father of the house. You say, 'I will do it later, I will do it tomorrow. Why do you frighten us? Have we not been promised forgiveness?' Yes, forgiveness is promised you, but it has not been promised to you that you shall see tomorrow. . . ."
>
> ". . . And how many people die before they can be baptized, sometimes after a lifelong catechumenate? Yes, beloved, when people get ill, they send somebody round to the Church or have themselves carried there in person; then they are baptized and renewed and it will be for their good. . . ."
>
> . . . His great anxiety was to let no one die unbaptized. We should remember that he was quite unable to conceive of a pious catechumen's being saved if he died a sudden death and was not baptized at the time.
>
> (Van der Meer, F., Augustine the Bishop, p. 150, including all the references to the saint's sermons from Frangipane's works.)

Scholars well acquainted with the writings of the Fathers are quite aware that the opinion concerning the baptism of desire was not universal. Historians of the Church are even more aware that the alleged vicariousness of intentional baptism was not at that time, or in any time prior to our own, part of the universal mind of the ecclesia discens, which includes the common consensus of the Catholic body taken as a whole, laity included. And this common "mind of the Church believing" is not restricted to the Masonically-influenced modern era we are in, but must, in order to be truly universal, extend throughout all the Christian centuries. With this perspective in mind, it is true to say that the theory of baptism of desire was not part of catechetical instruction in past ages, dealing as it did, with an abstruse matter that concerned more the divine activity than that of the Church militant. For it is up to God to see to it that any soul pleasing to Him does not die without the waters of salvation. Having studied the issue quite thoroughly (though I could be wrong) no highly authorized catechism contained such a supposition before the seventeenth century and the incumbent reign of Masonry and Rationalism. This fact alone would negate the claim of many that baptism of desire has always been considered by the consensus commune of the faithful as a doctrine of the faith.

The great Cappodocian school of saints, for example, who gave us two of our thirty-two doctors, Gregory Nazianzen and Basil the Great, as well as Saint Gregory of Nyssa, the brother of Basil, and others, fought diligently and pointedly this very theory of desire substituting for water. Saint Gregory the doctor said as follows:

> . . . If you were able to judge as man who intends to commit murder solely by his intention, and without any act of murder, then you could likewise reckon as baptized one who desired Baptism without having received Baptism. But since you cannot do the former, how can you do the latter? . . . If you prefer, we will put it this way; if, in your opinion, desire has equal power with actual Baptism, then make the same judgement in regard to glory. You would then be satisfied to desire glory, as though that longing itself

were glory. Do you suffer any damage by not attaining the actual glory as long as you have a desire for it? I cannot see it!

(Saint Gregory Nazianzen, "Oration on the Holy Lights" Patrologiae Graece 36, 40:23.)

Another Eastern doctor, Saint John Chrysostom, likewise insisted that a catechumen could not be saved without the baptism of water. This, along with his insistence that the majority of the clergy will not be saved, is why liberals find his discourses so irritating. Ives Congar, the liberal Dominican "theologian," criticizes the "golden-tongued" orator for his literal understanding of the Savior's baptism mandate in the book, The Wide World, My Parish, whose title he borrowed from the founder of Methodism, Wesley.

In any case, writes Congar, it is a fact that in these matters we no longer hold some Patristic opinions, or at least we honour the principles that led to these positions but differently from the Fathers. They did not know our idea of implicit faith. Saint John Chrysostom and other Fathers believed that catechumens were damned if they died before actually receiving baptism.

Though there are many quotes from Chrysostom I could offer to verify Congar's observation, the following brief line from the great Doctor's Homily on the Acts of the Apostles (Book 1, n. 8) will suffice to demonstrate his belief in the absolute necessity of water for the salvation of catechumens: "What do you suppose is my anguish when I hear that any person has been taken away unbaptized, when I reflect upon the intolerable punishments of that life, the inexorable doom." Some held the opinion that a catechumen who had received forgiveness of his sins prior to baptism and died before receiving the sacrament would be banished from heaven but not tormented in the hell of fire, for his state of justice would not warrant it. This seems reasonable but hardly likely. I think that they and Saint John Chyrsostom would have benefited from the light offered by Father Feeney in regard to God's particular Providence. For Father would say that such an event could not happen. For all whom God justifies will be saved if they persevere unto death in justice; only Father would insist that God would provide water for such a one. The fact that some have died without a record of their being baptized in no way proves that the sacrament was never conferred. That a catechumen who was in the state of justification may have died before being baptized is a sheer conjecture. And who are we to build a theology on probabilities? We must leave the record keeping to God and preach only what Christ has commanded in such important matters.

Indeed, there are many other Fathers who held the same view as Saint John Chrysostom. Congar knew what he was talking about for he was well versed in Patristic literature, having at his disposal in Europe more sources than we can gather here. The important point is that the Fathers who at times spoke differently than these Eastern doctors were merely enunciating an opinion about a hypothetical case. They were not drawing from the deposit of faith transmitted from apostolic times. Notice too, Congar admits that the idea of divine faith being "implicit" in pagans ignorant of Christ is not to be found in the Fathers, rather he admits it to be "our idea." Therefore, this liberal disagrees, as did Father Feeney, with the writer who composed the Holy Office Letter to Cardinal Cushing in which salvation through "implicit faith" is falsely attributed to

the traditional mind of the Church. Novelty that it was, it is easy to see why the Holy Ghost did not permit the Church in 1949 to officially promulgate this Letter to Cushing, signed only by Ottaviani's Secretary, Cardinal Marchetti-Selvaggiani, in the Acta Apostolicae Sedis. However, the liberals of the right-wing and left-wing never hesitated to flaunt this document as the final word, "Roma Locuta Est," declaring it to be infallibly inspired and accepted under pain of mortal sin. Interesting too, in the official footnote to passage 2:16 of Lumen Gentium, the Letter to Cushing is appended, but the most objectionable phrase boldly binding God Himself to the acceptance of a vague "implicit desire" for baptism as sufficient for an eternal sharing in and contemplation of the Divine Essence, was deleted. Abbot Jerome Theisen, O.S.B. comments on this in his book The Ultimate Church and the Promise of Salvation, page 57:

> The suppresion of votum implicitum is probably due to disenchantment with the term, especially since it was used indiscriminately to describe the situation of both separated Christians and the 'unevangelized' in their diverse relations to the Roman Catholic Church.

Furthermore, this footnote did not appear in the Relatios, that is, the reports which accompanied the official schema. What was in the Constitution was novel enough in itself, at least in the general impression created of salvation being possible via all denominations, owing to the weighty ambiguities qualifying the salvation dogma; but it is interesting that the peritus, or periti, responsible for adding the reference about the Father Feeney case, for consistency sake, was conscientious enough to remove the most objectionable part of the Marchetti-Selvaggiani Letter before tagging it on to an offical (though non-definitional) decree of an ecumenical synod. Here it should be noted (for those who are unaware) that Vatican II was not a defining council. It was, as Pope Paul insisted, a pastoral synod, with no new definitions or anathemas attached. This is admitted by all honest theologians even those who are of the Wanderer strain. In his article: "How Binding is Vatican II" in the Homiletic and Pastoral Review, July, 1981, Father Richard O'Connor, the author, cites the authority of Father Candido Pozo, S.J. who says, "In the case of Vatican II, it is to be expected that the Christian people would accept the doctrine exactly as the Council itself proposes it — that is to say, as non-infallible teaching." O'Connor adds:

> What is more important, however, is to make clear the kind of assent demanded of the faithful . . . What this means, as Pope John Paul II never tires of emphasizing when referring to Vatican II, is that it is to be interpreted in the light of Tradition, of other Councils and papal encyclicals; and, where found to be in conflict with these, disregarded.

This is a rather depressing way for the Church entrusted with the revelation of Christ to promote it.

There is much more to say concerning this question of baptism of desire. Saint Robert Bellarmine, as late as the sixteenth century, again speaking only of justified catechumens, refers to it merely as opinion. He himself happened to favor the opinion. Finding the contrary view in a very reputable theological manual of his time, he expressed mild disagreement. I will cite this quotation shortly for the purpose of

highlighting the fact that, even after the Council of Trent, no theologian ever considered the theory of baptism of desire as de fide. All were too educated in the faith to say such a thing. The theologians who proposed it as a conclusion based on reason knew well that the idea was nowhere to be found in Scripture, explicitly or implicitly. The two examples commonly used of the Holy Innocents and the Good Thief were both rejected due to the carelessly overlooked fact that these holy persons died under the Old Dispensation before the law of baptism was promulgated on Pentecost. Dismas, the thief, died in the same boat as Saint John the Baptist, Saint Joseph, and any pious believer back to Adam and Eve. And he did not go to heaven but to the Limbo of the Just which Christ chose to call Paradise, for He Himself would be there with Dismas, "that day." And where Jesus is, there is paradise. The conclusion of some saints about baptism of desire or blood was drawn without consideration of the particular Providence of God which is collateral with His very essence, veracity and omnipotence. Indeed, God manifests His providential power more in binding Himself to His own mandate for our salvation, that is, to the element of water. And, as is proven in so many documented cases (not to mention unrecorded ones), "the hand of the Lord is not shortened that He cannot save." (Isaias 59:1) He Who made us is quite capable of reaching all upon whom He has bestowed the fountain of His grace with the fountain of His water. In the few cases Church history brought forth of alleged cases of catechumens dying without baptism, it is incredible to believe that with all the people surrounding the person cited, such as Valentinian the Emperor, no one performed the service of baptism. And who knows but God that they had not already been baptized secretly as babes? From apostolic times, the Christians were instructed in an emergency to confer the sacrament upon those who needed it and not to wait for a priest. But, for the moment, I only wish to prove that those saints who favored baptism of desire in no way considered the opposite opinion as heretical or conflicting with revelation. Thus we see that Saint Robert did not accuse the author of the manual I referred to above of heresy, knowing, as he did, that many among the Fathers of the Church held its view. Notice in the quote below that Bellarmine phrases himself carefully as the virtue of charity requires, "in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas." Believing that the opinion seems "too severe," and avoiding any positive declarative pronouncement, he writes:

> But the author of the book, De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus, replies that they (catechumens dying without baptism) are not saved. But this appears too severe; certain it is that Saint Ambrose, in his oration on the death of Valentinian, expressly affirms that catechumens can be saved, of which number was Valentinian when he departed this life.
>
> (De. Eccl. Milit. lib. 3, cap. 3)

What Saint Robert sought to prove here in his thesis on the Church was that justified catechumens and repentant excommunicates alone, although they cannot be said to be members of the Church, can be saved because they belong to her in desire. According to the Redemptorist theologian of the last century, Father Michael Mueller, there was no thought in the sixteenth century that the possibility of salvation existed for anyone who departed this life except for Catholics in grace or justified catechumens. As to excommunicates, Father Perrone, a contemporary of Bellarmine, disagreed with the Jesuit Cardinal on this point, insisting (according to Father Mueller) that even they, despite their repentance, had to be absolved in the confessional. Perrone was wrong. But even his extreme view was not thought to be heretical at the time.

If the opposite opinion concerning catechumens were heretical, as everyone, especially so-called traditionalists, alleges today, then Saint Robert would have labelled it so. Finally, we cannot deny that saints, even doctors, can be wrong, otherwise they would always have been in unanimous agreement on every point of doctrine. We of the latter days, have the benefit of instruction in the wisdom the saints passed down in the truths they expounded correctly, as is the usual case. But we also benefit when in the abundance of their writing they posit an erroneous view, and a counter-reaction of equally concerned theologians in the same Church proves very enlightening. If there were no controversy over the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, for instance, it may never have been defined. And there were saints, other than Saint Thomas Aquinas, who did not believe it, or were leery of what they felt was a dangerous loophole in the doctrine of the universality of the Redemption. Saint Bernard, the otherwise "melifluous" crusader of Marian devotion, forbade his monks to engage themselves in the debate over the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception considering the favoring opinion to be too risky in implication. Saint Bernard was wrong, but who would call him a heretic? For the dogma had not then been defined, although testimonies in its favor were rife in Patristic writing. Without burdening you with more details, I could cite at least six assertions from the Summa Theologica of Saint Thomas which the Church completely rejects, though in his time the erroneous statements were tolerated. Of course, in regard to these errata in the Summa, there is a good book by a Dominican (title and author escape me) in which the writer points out those parts of the opus that were compiled by disciples shortly before and after the death of Saint Thomas. I am not sure whether his views on baptism of desire were in the unauthentic sections, though I am prone to doubt that they were.

The same holds true of Saint Robert himself, who also erred at times, for he too was human, although so learned that his mistakes were rather in historical criticism than in any of his doctrinal opinions. However, if one reads between the lines in his treatise on the Church and salvation for catecumens, his usual forcefulness and confidence is noticeably absent. He seems to be writing with a little bit of unnatural hesitancy, but you would have to read the entire treatise to understand what I am saying. Moreover, the Jesuit doctor was known to prefer the opinions of Don Scotus, the Franciscan, and Saint Bonaventure, on some points and even (according to Father Broderick — who fails to supply examples) the opinion of the Adoptionist heretic Durandus. Bellarmine also had irritated many conservatives, especially Spanish and French conservatives, with his unbalanced criticism of the "legends"of the Second Nocturns in the Breviary which he was assigned to help edit. No doubt some of these pious exaggerations were fabrications, but the Cardinal even doubted the tradition regarding Saint James the Greater's apostleship to Spain, Saint Denis the Areopagite and other of Our Lord's personal friends coming to France, and the ordeal of the patroness of philosophers, Saint Catherine of Alexandria's, before the pagan intellectuals. The Church accepted some of Saint Robert's editing, but stopped him short where he too readily dismissed the value of consistent oral tradition. This in no way means that Bellarmine was a modernist who doubted miracles, and oral testimonies; all it means is that he overreacted to a legitimate abuse, motivated as he was to remove all unnecessary obstacles for the conversion of the heretics. For he did believe, as no modernist believes, that heretics and their unconverted offspring, in good faith or bad faith, could not be saved without renouncing their false religion.

There is more to take note of. When the Council of Trent was defining the necessity of the sacrament of Baptism in re or in voto, the fathers were treating only the question of justification, not salvation. You will find Father Feeney's Bread of Life saturated with explanations of this essential distinction. This is so simple and clear that it is rather amazing that so many priests, especially so-called traditionalists,

ignore it completely, as they continue to discuss the baptism of desire as de fide, which it is not. The Council of Trent did not teach, nor did the fathers there intend to teach, that the water of baptism was not necessary for salvation in the case of a justified catechumen. If it were the intent to give the baptism of desire an authoritative status, contrary statements by non-defining local councils approved by previous Popes, would have to have been abrogated, and a decree would have been issued, which also would have appeared in the Council's Catechism. As everyone knows, or ought to know, this was not done. Rather, we find Pope Saint Pius V, in his Preface to the illustrious Catechism, emphasizing that "the Holy Synod intended that such things only should be treated of as might assist the pious zeal of pastors in discharging the duty of instruction, should they not be very familiar with the more abstruse questions of theological disputation."

Consequently the Catechism of Trent makes no mention of any other but water baptism. The following reference in the Catechism has been loosely misconstrued as a basis for the promotion of baptism of desire in our time. However it was not so misconstrued in the post-Trent age when theologians were more scrupulous in their avoidance of giving meanings to texts that were not there:

> On this class of persons (adults), however, the Church does not confer this sacrament hastily: she will have it deferred for a certain time; nor is the delay attended with the same danger, as in the case of infants, which we have already mentioned: and should any unforeseen accident deprive adults of baptism, their intention of receiving it, and their repentance for past sins, will avail them to grace and righteousness.

A careful theologian will notice that the Catechism here says nothing more than what was defined, although the de fide definition of the Council itself was more precisely worded. The Catechism does not say that the intention to receive baptism would suffice for salvation, but for grace and righteousness, that is, for justification. Hence, a catechumen in the state of grace is truly in no danger from without, for as a child of God, His heavenly Father is not going to allow him to perish if he has done his part in cooperation with grace. The only danger he is in is from himself, if he succumbs to temptation, or deliberately delays his baptism beyond the time prescribed by the Church. In such a case, the Council says he places himself in grave danger. An infant, however, can never be justified without water, so such a child is always in danger, and should be brought to the Church for baptism as soon as possible after birth. The converted adult can become, even before baptism (but never independent of it), an adopted child of God, and once in such a preferred condition God will see to it that no unforeseen accident deprive him of mortal life before his baptism. God may, however, allow unforeseen circumstances to interfer with his appointed time at the font, and it is in this instance, as the Catechism says, that God can elevate the catechumen to "grace and righteousness" anticipationally.

Still more, Saint Robert Bellarmine, who personally held that the water of baptism was not necessary for the salvation of a justified catechumen who died before receiving the sacrament, was careful not to include this view in his own catechism — which was, of course, based on that of Trent. Nor did his fellow Jesuit doctor, Saint Peter Canisius, include it in his. I am not contending that the error does not show up in other approved catechisms prior to the North American Baltimore Catechism, for I know that it does, as can be seen in the catechism of Saint Anthony Claret. What I am emphasizing is that the issue is debatable, and the greater arguments are against it. There is even a question whether editors added the baptism of desire to the

Intermediate Catechism of Saint John Neumann of Philadelphia after not finding it there in his original copy. We know for certain that an editor added a weak statement on the salvation doctrine to this saint's Intermediate Catechism without indicating, specifically, what he had edited . This was discovered when we learned the addition was made after Quanto Conficiamur was issued by Pope Pius IX in 1863, the saint having died in 1860. The original catechism of the American saint is in the Redemptorist archives in New York or Philadelphia. Judging from a translation we made of a lengthy discourse on Baptism this saint had composed, in which there is no mention of baptism of desire or blood, I would be somewhat surprised to find mention of three baptisms in the catechism he personally wrote. This I am going to have to discover for certain by taking a trip and viewing the original, which I intend to do. The Redemptorist Provincial of New England is very friendly to us, never ceasing to heap praises upon Father Feeney, our Founder, to whom he tells all that he owes his conversion when studying at Harvard University in the 1940s. Saint John Neumann's uncompromising doctrine is understandable as he was trained by the Redemptorists who, in his day (as is proved in the case of "America's 19th century Father Feeney," Michael Mueller, C.SS.R), were the staunchest fighters against the growing liberal heresy of the non-necessity of entering the Catholic Church for salvation. If Father Feeney were writing one hundred years ago, before the Masonic influence permeated the Church, his doctrinal book would have received an imprimatur from many bishops, for many did give their approval for books containing no less of a challenge on the issue of extra ecclesiam nulla salus. When one reads the writings of Saint Alphonsus de Ligouri, one sees where his sons learned the truth about where, and only where, salvation is to be found.

Indeed, on the question of baptism of desire you will find mention of it by only one Pope prior to Pope Pius XIIth, and that was Pope Innocent III, the same Pontiff who defined ex cathedra that no one at all could be saved outside the one universal Church of the faithful. It seems that a problematic case had been presented to the Holy See concerning a Jew who, fearing hellfire, was forced to baptize himself when he was in danger of death, due to the fact that those Jews by his side refused to do him the service. The Pope sent a letter in response to a question as to whether the man ought to be baptized by the Church after surviving the sickness that endangered his life. The Pontiff wrote that he must be rebaptized for no one can baptize himself. Then he added that if the Jew had died his faith in the sacrament would have won for him the same reward as the sacrament of faith. (Denz. # 413) This same Pope wrote similarly in response to a like question about a supposed priest who had been ordained, without ever having been baptized. The fact was discovered after the invalidly ordained's decease. Concerning him the Pope had written that Masses and prayers could be offered up for his soul. (Denz. # 388) In both of these cases it is evident that Pope Innocent was not defining a dogma, but merely expressing an opinion, which he did not base on the Scriptures, but simply on the authority of Saints Augustine and Ambrose.

We find the opinion but one other time expressed by Pope Pius XII in an address to some Italian midwives, an unlikely setting for binding the consciences of the universal Church. (This was not an official decree of Pius' pontificate, so it is not included in Denzinger's Enchiridion) When our antagonists bring up either of these non-infallible statements I propose for their consideration the following Canon passed in 563 at the regional Council of Braga (Portugal), and ratified by Pope John III: "Neither commemoration nor chanting is to be employed (at a Mass) for catechumens who have died without Baptism." Hence it would be most rash to place one reference given by a Pope to an audience of midwives as a solemn pronouncement, when in another address the same Pope did not hesitate to speak to an audience of scientists about the "millions and millions of years that have passed since the fiat of creation." Of course,

I need not explain to a man of your intelligence what notes are necessary to make a papal teaching on a non-defined issue infallible.

The very fact that, in the war against the literal meaning of the salvation dogma, theologians have not been able to come up with one papal utterance prior to Pope Pius IX's two non-definitional encyclicals, should be proof in itself that the misapplied and stretched interpretation of this Pontiff's words is incorrect. In Singulari Quadam (1854) it is more than obvious that after extolling the inscrutability and infinity of God's mercies in language more elatory than precise — since such an area must indeed remain above our understanding — Pope Pius rather abruptly pulls in the reins on what was about to expand into sheer speculation with this stringent conclusion:

> For, in truth, when released from these corporeal chains "we shall see God as He is" (1 John 3:2), we shall understand perfectly by how close and beautiful a bond divine mercy and justice are united; but, as long as we are on earth, weighed down by this mortal mass which blunts the soul, let us hold most firmly that, in accordance with Catholic teaching, there is "one God, on faith, one baptism" (Eph. 4:5); it is unlawful to proceed further in inquiry.

Now who is breaking the law?

And though we would grant that Pius IX did do some fraternizing with the then escalating theories of salvation for the "invicibly ignorant,' his actual words gave the liberals no real ground to stand on. They had to mistranslate his words into vernacular to create an impression that I doubt the Pope wanted to create. What the Pontiff said in Quanto Conficiamur was the reasonable truth that no one in invincible ignorance of the positive commands of God would suffer the pain of eternal "torment" for things he did, or did not do, in ignorance. There is no way you can draw out of that the meaning the liberals have given it, that the invincibly ignorant go to heaven in such a state. Many theologians other than ourselves have gone out of their way to show this, not only in the last century, but as late as in the 1960s. Both Father Joseph Fenton and Father Eminyan, have written on Pius IX's true meaning, and both of them agree with Father Feeney that he certainly did not say one could be saved in ignorance. So the so-called traditionalists are wrong again in condeming our study of this encyclical as expressed in Brother Francis' booklet The Dogma of Faith Defended Against Right-Wing Liberals. I will send along a copy of this for you as well. It is right to the point.

To be honest, I have to point out that Fathers Fenton and Eminyan agreed on the correct meaning of Quanto Conficiamur, but they evaded the doctrine by appealing to Pope Pius XII. However, in the nineteenth century, as I indicated already, there were in America (and in Europe as well — Archbishop Hay, the Scotish convert for one) many theologians who defended the doctrine exactly as did Father Feeney, and who interpreted the meaning of Pope Pius IX's encyclicals in the exact uncompromising sense our persecuted Founder did. Father Mueller and the lay theologian and convert, Orestes Brownson (who was buried in the chapel of Notre Dame University), worked indefatigably in exposing misinterpretations that liberals like the American Paulists were proliferating to the consternation of the faithful and the scandal of non-Catholics. And when these views were being treated with respect at the First Vatican Council in 1869, Saint Anthony Claret, the only saint at the Synod, was so aggrieved at what he heard uttered by so many, even the majority, that he suffered a stroke during the sessions. Within a few months he died. The liberal view of the salvation doctrine showed up in the schema of the Decree on the Church of Christ, but heaven intervening,

it was never passed. The Synod was abruptly interrupted by the invasion of France by Kaiser Wilhelm's Prussians.

I should also comment on your proffered analogy of the Sabbath for man, not man for the Sabbath. With the promulgation by the Savior of the Gospel of salvation, and His establishment of the means to attain it, the Old Law saw its fulfillment. As you know, there were laws in the Old Testament, the keeping of which were necessary for justification, and ultimately, through Christ, for salvation. These were necessary, indispensably, as a means; and there were laws of ritual, such as the keeping of the Sabbath and divinely prescribed diet which were necessary by obligation of precept for a Jew — though not intrinsically necessary in themselves for justification. Rather, they were necessary as a code of conduct and liturgical observance, as we have also in the New Law, to remind the chosen people of their special calling to holiness and faith. The Faith in the Old Testament was centered in the hope of the Redeemer to come, promised to Adam by the One True God they worshipped, the knowledge of Whom and worship of Whom were absolutely necessary for justification of Jew or Gentile. The keeping of the Sabbath was obviously no more of an obligation for the Jew of Old as the attendance of Sunday Mass is for the faithful today, speaking merely by way of the right spirit of obedience. There is, however, an essential difference, which obliges the faithful much more after Christ, since it is the Savior Himself Whom we receive in the Eucharist when we fulfill the law. The more compelling the motivation, the more serious the sin in deliberate omission. These disciplinary laws, as Jesus certainly indicated, were binding by precept, not by an absolute necessity. A Gentile of the Old Law who was unaware of the Mosaic discipline could still be saved if he had the true Faith. (Witness Job; the Queen of Sheba; Ruth the Moabitess, an ancestress of Our Lord Himself; Darius the Persian; Naaman the Syrian; the three Magi; and so many others.)

So too, in the New Law, a convert baptized in the true faith of Jesus Christ, who, on account of no mission in his land lives as a Christian without any knowledge of the Holy Mass, is obviously dispensed of the obligation to attend it. Laws that are not intrinsically connected to piety but are merely so extrinsically, such as fast laws or liturgical rubrics, in an emergency can be discarded with the supreme canon in mind "salus animarum." Physical impossibility always excuses one from laws of discipline. However, some disciplinary laws are never physically impossible to fulfill, and if such law is known, it is necessary that it be observed under pain of eternal loss, such as, for example, the law of saying one's prayers, or keeping holy the Lord's day (even if only by one's inward spirit of devotion), or approaching in sin or with an impediment a sacrament of the living, as in the case of a man secretly married attempting Matrimony with another woman, or a married man in the Latin Rite seeking Orders while living with his wife, and so on. These are disciplinary laws, intrinsically related to piety. Other laws, such as those which stem from the Ten Commandments, could never be discarded, for their infraction is always evil for all, God having written such things within the heart of every man. Hence, Jesus could never have allowed His disciples to bear false witness against their neighbor at any time for any reason, saying that the these Commandments were made for men not men for these Commandments. There is a big difference between picking corn for nourishment, thereby performing a necessary labor on the Sabbath, and breaking the spirit of the Law, which is always binding. This discussion of morality and ethical law can become very complex and we will end up off target. Besides, dogmas are of a different degree of necessity than discipline. Some moral laws, such as the taking of someone else's property, can be discarded to save a life or for some other urgent good. Again, this is common sense. Other moral laws can never be discarded, such as refrainment from impurity. But dogmas can

never, in any case, be diluted one iota, for any reason, even to save one's own life or that of another. For in this case, dishonest apostasy, to save one's life is to lose it.

Unrepentant murderers, thieves, adulterers, and idolaters are obviously in a state intrinsically opposed to righteousness and are outside the way of salvation. These indispensable moral and religious truths all men ought to know, as Saint Paul says, and observe without the aid of revelation. Yet, justification is not due merely to the observance of the dictates of a properly informed conscience. It is dependent upon "supernatural faith," a condition clearly expostulated in the Epistles and repeatedly emphasized by the Church right up to the Council of Trent that placed an anathema upon anyone who should question it. Hence, there are truths to be known that come from God revealing and man "hearing" (Romans 10:17), the assent to which is intrinsically -- that is, absolutely — necessary for man to be reborn in divine adoptive sonship. And too, Christ Our Lord has obliged another condition, without the fulfillment of which, man cannot be saved. It is the water of Baptism. He may be justified before he receives the water, as the Council of Trent confirms. But according to the mandate of Our Savior, Who can neither deceive nor be deceived, he cannot be saved without it.

If this were not an absolute and indispensable law, how is it that the Church has so unflinchingly maintained the impossibility of salvation for unbaptized children? And how is it that the Church has constantly qualified this particular sacrament of regeneration as having a necessitas medii (necessity of means), in contradistinction with the type of necessity the sacrament of Confession imposes. neccesitas precepti (necessity of precept)? If anyone at all can be saved without Baptism, nevermind the millions they are saying these days are saved without it (indeed, they say more unbaptized are in heaven than baptized) then this qualification of a necessity of means should be reduced to that of precept only. For necessary means implies that the goal cannot be reach without it; precept implies that the goal cannot be reached for those who know about the means and refuse to makes use of them. So, in light of Our Lord's mandate, which He solemnified in His last will and testament before He ascended into heaven, God, Who hypothetically could have saved mankind in any way He chose, has decreed to save us by Charity enlivened by Faith and by the sacrament of water Baptism. Hence, He has bound Himself to His own terms. This is how the missionaries of old understood it, as clearly as Christ said it. That is why they endured so many hardships risking their lives to squeeze a drop of dew from a moistened leaf upon the heads of converts whose earthly existence as children of God would always be in peril. They believed that the water was necessary. They knew the religion of evangelization, not the elaborated intricacies of the schools. They picked up their feet, preached, and baptized, having no time for idle speculation about hypothetical situations of justified persons dying "unexpectedly" without Baptism. They were too busy pouring water to think about how to rationalize baptism of desire.

The theologians of our day, who are so preoccupied with disputations over the idle word of implicit (and convenient) man-made Christianity and invisible baptism, would do well to remember that the Dominican Order is not named after Saint Thomas Aquinas, but after someone else whom history records to have converted many more souls to Christ than the Summa Theologica. Now I am not depreciating the Summa, or the need for scholarly theologians. I am only saying that today there is an imbalance. Traditionalists, especially, are more concerned with what they can garner out of the Summa to support their views (which is all well and good) than they are with making converts. Saint Dominic and Saint Francis Xavier did not care about a so-called baptism of desire; they were rather concerned about the Baptism Christ instituted, for they were sure that this one led to eternal life. Nor can it be denied that the renowned Jesuit missionary and his disciples converted more Mohammedans than Saint Thomas'

Summa Contra Gentiles, composed by the angelic doctor for the same purpose. Any Dominican missionary who came back from the Orient would have hastened to tell Saint Thomas that Moslems are not going to read logical books exposing their errors, except for a very rare Moslem. They are fanatically enslaved to a one-doctrine religion that is more anti-Incarnation than pro-anything. Moslems do not respond to theological disputation but to authoritative preaching of the simple truth, such as the exhortation of Saint Francis before the Sultan exemplified. Such however is not the case with heretics. For them, both preaching and disputation are necessary, oral often being more productive than written, human nature being what it is.

I know that you will not construe these remarks as depreciatory of the Summa. I enjoy reading the Summa immensely and derive more knowledge from that one book than all other books of theology combined. But what I read in the Summa, and what antagonists to the salvation doctrine read in it, are often two different things. I have to say that in view of what the liberals have done with the baptism of desire, Saint Thomas must be looking down from heaven right now with great regret that he ever penned those words — if indeed he ever did pen them. It is not beyond possibility that some Dominicans added them to the Summa on their own. For they did this very thing in the case of the revelations of Saint Catherine of Sienna a century later. Not only (as we read in her Dialogues) did they put on the holy woman's tongue, as if coming straight from Our Lord, the most unlikely scholastic language expounding the three types of baptisms, but they even "managed" to "convince" Saint Catherine that she heard Our Lady tell her that she was not Immaculately conceived. Rene Laurentin and Frere Michel from the Abbe de Nantes monastery both point this out. Pope Benedict XIV discussed this instance of forced suggestion in his work on the Beatificationand Canonization of the Servants of God, (sec.III, p.53). So does A. Poulain in his Graces d'oraison, pp. 355-356.

It would seem superfluous, moreover, for God to have performed so many miracles in providing fountains of water for the purpose of baptizing converts whose circumstances, sometimes (as in the case of one of the soldiers assigned to execute Saint Alban of England) meant for them a new life that would last in its mortal stage but a matter of minutes. Thus we see in Saint Bede's History of the English Church and People that a miraculous fountain sprang up at the place where the holy Alban was to be beheaded. Though Saint Bede missed the point himself as to why the fountain appeared, it seemed obvious that God provided it for the baptism of the guard who was converted along the way by other miracles performed before his eyes by the saint. The new convert was executed right after Alban, as Saint Bede says, in his own blood, but not (we would add) without having first received the spiritual benefit of that miraculous fountain whose appearance was for some purpose other than to quench the thirst of a dying man. As the case usually is with a historian, Saint Bede was relating the facts as they were reported to him. Therefore, he did not make the more than evident assumption that Saint Alban found the three seconds needed to baptize his coverted executioner. We also read in the story of the imprisonment of Saints Peter and Paul's in the Mamertine how a fountain gushed forth from the earth enabling the apostles to baptize the converted guards. If God would bring forth water from a rock to refresh the parched bodies of the children of Israel in the desert, how much more solicitous would He be to produce such a fountain to regenerate thirsty souls!

And too, for what purpose do we read in the lives of so many saints that God raised catechumens to life at their command, unless it be that those resuscitated and unbaptized souls may appear before their Judge with the proper wedding garment? Such incidents are found recorded in the lives of Saint Martin of Tours, his nephew Saint Patrick, Saint Peter Claver, and many others. In order to further the error of

baptism of desire, Father Thurston, in his revised edition of Father Butler's Lives of the Saints, deleted the story of Saint Martin's raising of a catechumen as well as adding the supposition to the story of Saint Emerentiana (sister of Saint Agnes) that she was "baptized in her own blood." Father Butler himself never posited such an interpretation. He just left his readers with the recorded facts and drew no such conclusion.

The cases commonly brought forth "proving" the efficacy of baptism of desire or blood (baptism of blood really being the best example of baptism of desire) include those of Saint Emerentiana, the little brother of Saint Perpetua, the fortieth martyr of Sebaste, and Valentinian the Emperor. In each, it is far more incredible to believe that these individuals were not baptized than to believe that they were. Just because there was no historical record of their baptism is no proof at all that they were not baptized. Who is to say that in the heat of the battle in which he was engaged, the Emperor Valentinian did not turn to someone before his final charge, especially perceiving the great danger he was in, and ask for the simple service. Perhaps, too, the man who baptized him did so in secret or perhaps, he was killed himself. Who knows but God! The same is plausible of Saint Emerentiana. After seeing the danger she was in when her own sister was killed, it is difficult to imagine that she did not have someone baptize her first, before she risked her life in visiting Agnes' tomb. It is incredible to believe she did not do this, especially when the catechumens were instructed in such danger to have themselves baptized at once. Or can you imagine Saint Perpetua, as a believing Christian, watching her little brother of seven years die without baptizing him? The theoreticians say that, because her older sisters were not Christians, then neither could her younger brother have been, although Saint Perpetua never says that he was not a Christian. Nor is it certain that the happy place where she saw her brother being taken in her last vision was heaven. It could well have been the Limbo of the unbaptized. Who knows these things but God! Saint Perpetua never said that the boy was taken to heaven. Do you see how vacuous is all this conjecture? And the fortieth martyr of Sebaste is the most incredible example of all. Imagine this man sitting all night on ice with thirty-nine Christians and no one baptizing him. But one drop of water poured over him is all that would be necessary. Was there no way of getting water on a frozen lake? Of course one could! And who is to say that the man had not been a secret Christian employed in the army, and cowardly hiding the fact? The Roman army under Diocletian was heavily populated with Christians at that time. For prior to the persecution, this same Emperor had begun his rule in a most magnanimous manner, allowing the Faith to propagate itself quite freely until the wretch Galerian changed him into a persecutor.

This is not to say that we, or Father Feeney, would ever hold the absurdity that a catechumen or any convert willing to shed his blood for Christ with true faith could ever be lost. For "greater love than this no man hath," Christ said. Our antagonists are most calumnious when they allege this, as they are when they accuse us of the other absurdity that the Good Thief did not go to heaven. What we are saying is that, to protect the truth of Jesus' words, water would be supplied, if need be even miraculously, for any justified but unbaptized person about to die. Nor did Father Feeney ever think that the Cantate Domino of Pope Eugene IV applied to Catholic catechumens who shed their blood without Baptism. Much to our embarrassment a rebellious faction of self-proclaimed disciples of Father Feeney have scandalized our cause by teaching that this Papal Bull applies not only to heretics who die for their blasphemies, but to catechumens as well who are not truly in the Church. They are headed by a Brother Thomas Augustine, who has appropriated our property at the Center, and who publishes another version of our magazine from the different P.O. Box #1000. Such is our Cross. And this is not all! Other so-called disciples of Father

Feeney are to be found in this country, who attack our community and spread confusion among potential supporters by accusing the authentic order here of teaching baptism of desire simply because we make the distinction on the issue between opinion and dogma.

As you can quite clearly see from this treatise we do not endorse the baptism of desire, nor do we consider those who disagree with us on this point, and yet still believe that there is no salvation outside the Church, to be in heresy. But we have yet to find one priest who believes the salvation doctrine as the Church intended it to be believed, and as the saints believed it, and who at the same time finds our insistence on the necessity of baptism of water extreme. Everytime a priest throws at us a quote from Saint Thomas or Saint Augustine about the baptism in desire, we inevitably find that he also believes sincere heretics and infidels can be saved remaining in their false religions. This was very openly brought before our attention by a recent visit we had with Father Williamson of the Society of Saint Pius X. After arguing over the issue of baptism of desire, which the liberals in the Society always begin their attack on sound doctrine with, we asked Father WIlliamson, frankly, if he believed, as does Archbishop Lefebrve, that a Mohammedan can be saved without abjuring his infidelism. Father WIlliamson answered that he did so believe, provided that the person concerned had never heard the Gospel of Christ, or had only heard lies about what Christians really believe. He said that he agreed with Archbishop Lefebrve, and considered this view to be "thinking with the mind of the Church," namely, that Mohammedans, Buddhists, Hindus, Jews, and heretics can be saved if they are in ignorance of Catholic teaching, or have had it presented to them poorly. He was quick to add that they are not saved through their errors but, as it were, in spite of their errors, through the graces of the Catholic Church. I informed him that this view is exactly the same as Karl Rahner's, and that there was no saint who ever thought that way. In fact, a century ago a man holding the views of Father WIlliamson (who is himself a convert) would not have been received into the Catholic Church had he expressed them to many priests and bishops. Indeed, Father Isaac Hecker, Founder of the Paulists, who held the same view as WIlliamson, was not received into the Church by Bishop Fitzpatrick of Boston who conscientiously considered him devoid of divine and Catholic Faith for this very reason. And it was because of Hecker's liberal view that he was later dismissed from the Redemptorist Order. If Father WIlliamson had tried to come into the Church three hundred years ago in his native England, the "Recusant" priests working underground in that sad land would not have received him either, for these priests made a point of requiring their converts to confess that, in coming into the Roman Catholic Church, they were abandoning the pathway to hell. In fact, Father Williamson would have had to search around pretty far to find a priest in those ages of faith who would have allowed him to become a Catholic with the views he espouses. I do not say this to criticize Williamson, but rather to expose the real liberalism behind Archbishop Lefebrve whom we have refrained from exposing for too long. His priests rarely desist from accusing us of heresy, as they know very little theology and are practically destitute of all charity. If one has this virtue of charity, he rejoices in the truth when he hears it; he does not qualify it, minimize it, or seek in every way to undermine it. And if a man has charity, he would not be so anxious to put the salvation of millions of infidels and Protestants, whether they are in good faith or bad faith, in jeopardy by such stupid and cruel theorizing about the "narrow way" of Christ's one saving revelation.

When Christ our Savior descended into the River Jordan to be baptized and met the humble protest of Saint John the Baptist, He said these oft-forgotten words: "Suffer it to be so now. For it becometh us to fulfill all justice." (Matt. 3:15) We are justified by faith, Saint Paul says; and, says Our Lord, our justice is fulfilled in the laver of regeneration. "For, with the heart, we believe unto justice; but, with the

mouth, confession is made unto salvation." (Romans 10:10) The confession of which Saint Paul speaks is the confession of faith recited at baptism by the initiate. The catechumen — as the Scripture teaches in those three cases presented for our edification and instruction in the Acts of the Apostles: Cornelius,the eunuch of Queen Candace, and Saint Paul himself — can, if his love of God is sufficiently ardent, be first justified by faith prior to his baptism, but that justice must be fulfilled according to the law of Christ in the sacrament of water. The angel did instruct Cornelius, a gentile enlightened in the pure faith of Jewish Messianic expectancy, to send for Saint Peter so that "he might tell thee what thou must do." (Acts 8:6) And when Peter had come at God's behest to Cornelius, the Roman centurion asked to be taught so that he might "hear all things whatsoever are commanded by the Lord." (8:33) And when the Holy Ghost fell upon the gentile and his whole household, Peter said "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?" And they were baptized. Some theologians had proposed in the sixteenth century that since justification made one a child of God, then baptism was superfluous, for such a one must be saved so long as he be an adopted child. To them Saint Robert Bellarmine urged the authority of Saint Augustine to the contrary: "Further, Saint Augustine says that Cornelius the Centurion, although he was praised in the Scriptures, was not yet such that he could have been saved unless he became incorporated in the Church through the sacrament of baptism." Hence we read that the angel told him to send for Saint Peter that he may hear the things that he "must do" and believe. As the Fathers taught, after Pentecost, explicit faith in the Savior was necessary for salvation. Cornelius, in whose person can be counted all the children of Noah through Japheth, was in the state of grace, but not yet such that he could be saved. He needed baptism, and Saint Peter conferred it, fulfilling his justice. The eunuch of Candace, in whose person are to be counted all the children of Noah through Cham, also possessed the one true faith in the Hebrew religion. He was justified, no doubt, by his faith, had Christ preached to him by Philip the deacon who came to him in a miraculous way, and had his justice fulfilled in a pool by the roadside. And lastly, Saint Paul, after having the Gospel announced to him in a very miraculous manner by the Savior Himself, believed, was justified, and had his justice fulfilled when Ananias poured the water of life upon him. Now Paul represents all the children of Noah through Sem. Here you have it from the authority of the Holy Ghost. Three miraculous instances of what God will do to reach a worthy man (or a not so worthy man in the case of Saul of Tarsus) with the truth necessary for salvation. The whole world is to be seen in these three men. That is why Scripture gives them to us, for all the race of men descend from these three sons of Noah. Indeed as the prophet Isaias said: "The hand of the Lord is not shortened that he cannot save." (Ch. 59:1)

Why then did Father Feeney consider it necessary in this century to insist so emphatically on the absolute necessity of water baptism for salvation? Why did he think his opinion so urgent, knowing as he did that in regard to catechumens, he could not find many doctors after the early Fathers on his side? First, I would say, it was a grace given to him in an age of unbelief to protect the absolute veracity of Our Lord's solemn utterances, especially those which were preceded by the Savior's unique and authoritative introduction: "Amen, Amen, I say unto thee!" Second, because he was attempting to completely remove the support the heretical teaching against the salvation doctrine was getting from the abuse of baptism in desire.

I intend to develop this point much more thoroughly in the book I am preparing on the entire issue. For now, by way of overview, I hope that you can see the point of the following explanation. We must begin by admitting that when those saints who used the idea of baptism in desire were writing, or preaching, the whole Christian world took the doctrine No Salvation Outside the Church for granted. No one ever

questioned it. Even the Protestant divines who broke away from the Church insisted in their Creeds that there is no salvation outside the Church, thinking themselves to be the true Church. In Luther's Augsburg Confession, you will find the statement "Outside the Roman Catholic Church there is no salvation," for Luther always thought that his was the real Roman Catholic Church. The Presbyterian Profession used in Scotland contains the same doctrine. When some saints used the expression baptism in desire (never "of" desire, for the Scripture and the Nicene Creed clearly teach "unum baptisma") they were only speaking about a justified believer who professed the Catholic and Divine Faith. Inculpability in one's ignorance would never lead the minds of those saints to conclude such a person had a baptism in desire.

Despite the clear teaching of the defining Church and Saint Paul on the dogma of "one baptism," Father Williamson of the Pius X Society opened his conversation with us with the insistence that "there are three baptisms." It never seems to occur to these priests that they are making a mockery of the Nicene Creed which they sing every Sunday. They are so unconcerned about what the Church really teaches that they do not even make an effort to express their heresy at least in less blatantly heterodox terms. It is heresy to say that there are three baptisms. When I pointed out to Father this error (not using the word heresy, of course), he just shrugged as if it were an issue of sheer semantics. No saint ever said there are three baptisms. Even Saint Thomas (at least, we have to assume - uncertain as we are if he actually wrote the articles on Baptism), who was the first to develop a theology of the other kinds of baptisms, insists that they are all "one baptism" owing to their necessary orientation towards the only Baptism Christ instituted for salvation. What those Doctors cited said was that the inability to receive the one baptism before death could excuse from the loss of heaven martyrs, and possibly even catechumens who may have died from natural circumstances.

To summarize: Some Fathers refused to believe that any catechumen could be saved without the water of baptism because of the clear teaching of Christ, refusing to postulate any opinion as to the special cases which they left up to God; other Fathers, perhaps the majority, held that for a martyred catechumen salvation could be granted without the sacrament; others, still, believed that both martyrs and catechumens who died of other circumstances could be saved without the water; another group of Fathers held that a catechumen who died from circumstances other than martyrdom could not be saved at all; and finally, some Fathers expressed opinions on the subject that varied and were often contradictory, displaying evidence of obvious confusion, which is only natural in one who is scrupulous both for the word of God as well as for the mercy of God, when he confronts a mystery the best solution of which would have been to rely on God's Providential salvific WIll and Omnipotence.

Father Leonard Feeney, in his effort to get at the root of the problem, felt that once the door of a Church, a very visible Church born from a very visible Redemption, is open to membership via invisible and subjective ways then the germ is planted that could foster destruction of dogma in a less faithful age such as our own that is dominated by the atmosphere of self-love and Masonic anti-dogmatism. In the ages of Faith, there was a tremendous holy fear to tamper with revelation by appealing to human rationalization. Challenging doctrines were accepted as they came, and reason helped in expounding them, not diluting them. For this reason, we find insistence on Saint Augustine's part that man can merit nothing supernaturally without grace, and that even the response to grace by which we are justified is itself a grace that God gives to whom He will. In the African doctor's view, all men receive sufficient grace but not "saving" grace. He based this view on the problematic case of children who die unbaptized and are lost. Since they never received "saving" grace, being too

young to reason, he concluded that only the predestined were given this efficacious grace. Saint Prosper of Aquitaine, his disciple, had a hard time defending the great Doctor against his antagonists, some of whom were Pelagian, but others of whom were perfectly Catholic (like Saint Vincent of Lerins) and who objected that God wills the salvation of all men (even unbaptized children, though why He permits them to be lost remains a mystery), and that therefore all men are able to respond enough to grace so as to receive from God "saving" grace. Of course, saving grace meant to them, not to the liberals of today, the rejection of false religion and the embracment of the Gospel.

Then too, there is the example of the controversy over the Immaculate Conception. Saint Thomas was very much afraid to dilute the dogma of the universal infection of all men under sin by making even one exception for Our Lady. The saints preferred being uncomfortable with a challenging truth than tampering with it to satisfy a logical deduction of reason. Hence you find battles over doctrine throughout the Church's history, battles which would be hardly worth the effort to engage in, if these truths were deemed by those soldiers to be unnecessary. So, Saint Thomas was wrong about the Immaculate Conception, but he was right that all men are due by generation to inherit the stain of original sin, even Our Lady. What he did not see, but which the Church later had to define, was that the Mother of God, was redeemed preventively at the very moment of her conception. In other words, what was due to her as a daughter of Adam never touched her because God intervened historically and prevented the contamination. This "exception" — which is not really an "exception" in the exact sense of the dogma at hand and the meaning of the word — was implicitly taught in Scripture and explicitly taught in tradition. Indeed, there was even a Mass honoring this feast from antiquity. Nevertheless, until the Church defined it, one could not call anyone a heretic for denying it, although there definitely was a culpable fault in those who did deny it, otherwise there would be no merit in those great saints who championed it even to the point of desiring to die for it. You see, the saints were moved by dogmatic truth. They didn't just sit idly back and allow an error to propagate because it had not been officially anathematized. They fought for truth, always ready to submit to a solemn decision on the matter, if no such decision had previously been made.

Do you see the diligence of the saints to defend the literal meaning of the Scripture, when a literal meaning is clearly called for? Yet, on the question of baptism in desire, you see this same diligence in other saints. To them the fulfilling of God's justice in the sacrament of baptism was His affair. If God took a catechumen prematurely, humanly speaking, who are we to be His counsellors and speculate on other means of salvation for this special case? Who are we to decide what is a special case? Father Feeney, I believe, received the grace of avoiding such speculation, allowing for sheer faith to reign. For Father Feeney did not always reject the baptism in desire. In fact when the Holy Office cracked down on him via the letter of Cardinal Marchetti-Sevaggiani, without ever giving him the hearing he asked repeatedly for, or a "written" statement of the "errors" he was alleged to hold, the baptism in desire was nowhere in the picture. It was his literal defence of the salvation dogma that irritated a hierarchy already infiltrated with the philosophy of Masonic toleration.

To pretend that Vatican II was the beginning of the Church's troubles is ridiculous. Vatican II was Pope Pius XII's Council. It was his bishops who launched the auto-demolition. And the infiltration goes much further back than during the reign of Pius XII. The same doctrinal battle over the salvation dogma was waged in America (and France too) in the last century. And Rome chose to stay out of it, continuing to stay out of it until Pope Pius XII gave the liberals the loopholes they wanted. It was after 1949 when the Holy Office responded to the Center's first written expose of the heresy in Reply to a Liberal, that Father Feeney began to target the baptism in desire as

erroneous. He never called the view "heretical" as he had himself espoused it in his earlier days writing for the Jesuits. Later, he began to see the weakness of it, although he allowed both views to appear in the Reply, an article for which he took responsibility even though he was not its author. Then, almost as if he was hit with a special grace, he began attacking the view in his lectures, repeatedly drawing attention to the conclusions the liberals were making out of it. He knew full well that many saints expressed a different view. That is what convinces me that his stand was a direct inspiration from the Holy Ghost. No one, absolutely no one in his day, was more excited about the saints and doctors of the Church than Father Leonard Feeney. He talked about them all the time, read them, memorized all he could about them, and taught everyone to love them. There is no way he would have taken a view opposite from Saint Thomas or Saint Augustine unless there were extreme reasons for so doing, and unless the matter were still open for opinion. His reverence for these saints was such that he never called them into the issue. For he had a childlike fear of having to publicly disagree with any of them. This he ought to have done. In not doing so, he opened himself up to unjust criticism. Sometimes, Father Feeney's reverence for saints got in his way, and on the one issue of baptism in desire, he tended to make use of the canonized allies on his side, while politely putting aside the testimony of other holy men. But, as I said before, he was fighting a far more serious war, and he had received more specific lights than they. In his childlike but irrefutable reliance on the oft-repeated interferences of God's Particular Providence, he was able to confidently defend the absolute veracity of Jesus' last will and testament and its indispensability.

Nor was Father unique in emphasizing Providence. Saint Thomas appeals to it in answering an objection about Faith in the Incarnation being necessary for salvation. The objection posits the hypothetical case of a man raised by wolves in the forest, who never heard the Gospel, nor could he hear it. In such a case, says the angelic doctor, God would send him a preacher to instruct him or enlighten him interiorly lest he depart this life without knowing what must be known for salvation. (De Veritate q.14., art. 11, ad. 1) And in another place, he affirms that God would send an angel to instruct such a one. The case is sheerly hypothetical. No one grows up in a forest among wolves without being first born among men. But Saint Thomas allows this type of perverse objection, more common to our age which is so obsessed with the abnormal, to emphasize the same point Father Feeney emphasized. Only Father extended it, for more urgent reasons, and held that this same Providence would supply a human minister and water for baptism if such were needed.

Father began to see the danger in the baptism of desire theory in exactly the same way that Saint Gregory Nazianzen saw it, as I noted some pages back. If the premise is granted that the desire for the sacrament is sufficient to replace actual reception, then where do we draw the line? Surely, if one is worthy enough for heaven without the water, then how can the Church militant bar catechumens from the Holy Eucharist? Can they who are worthy of membership in the Church triumphant be unworthy of membership in the Church militant? Our opponents may answer that this is a ridiculous argument, for the saved have no occasion to return to the Church militant, and they are right. Nevertheless, the dilemma still stands. According to them, the same person who is qualified to enter eternal glory by desire is unqualified to enter the Church militant by desire. And furthermore, if desire is always taken for the deed, in religious matters, what about the union we acheive through Christ in Holy Communion. Can this be replaced by spiritual communions? With Confession, the argument does hold, for the Church has so defined that sins can be remitted if there is intention to receive the sacraments of the dead as soon as one can. But Jesus never made the sacrament of Confession an absolute necessity of means as He did with Baptism and

the Eucharist. Concerning the necessity of the Eucharist you can read Father Feeney's opinion in Bread of Life.

Taking the premise of baptism in desire to further conclusions, who is to say that God will not accept a desire for the truth as possession of the truth? And this too, is what is being preached today by our missionaries of desire. So the missions are devoid of nearly all evangelization, with the exception of a courageous priest here or there who stills believes Faith in Christ is necessary. Now that we have opened up the door of subjectivization, who is to say that God would not accept an implicit desire to know the truth (or to be baptized) as may be conjectured in the case of an avowed infidel, Jew, or pagan who would be disposed to accept Christ if someone explained the Gospel well enough to him? And this appears to be the position of those so-called traditional priests who, in their pride, elevate themselves upon podiums built by flatterers and never seem to weary in hurling their anathemas from pulpit and pen as the final say on all religious matters. Though there are exceptions in the Society of Saint Pius X, my experience has been that they are mainly a negative breed of scandalmongers who have no interest in converting the countries they are in, because they do not think non-Catholics need converting, only Novus Ordo Catholics and the lapsi. We are informed by the Society's priests that their view is the mind of the Church. Or to put it as Father WIlliamson did, "I think that it is the mind of the Church." Imagine! On a matter so important as salvation he is willing to merely "think" one can be saved in a false religion. This is what I mean when I state that they have no charity. How can we risk the salvation of souls with a theology that is not sure and positive? Father Williamson, if he were possessed of charity, would be absolutely certain infidels can go to heaven before he enunciates such a heresy that can only reaffirm the missions in their present pitiable state. What cruelty to unbelievers and heretics! To tell them you "think" they can be saved without becoming Catholic! In the other literature I sent you, you will find reason to speedily agree, I am sure, that this view is not the mind of the Church, but is the mind of the Masonically influenced hierarchy of our day. No saint ever talked this way. The radical liberals all admit this in their blasphemous books, because they do not mind being honest in condemning the past. But the so-called traditionalists refuse to see it, because, though they share the same heresy as the liberals, they prefer not to admit it. The liberals could care less if they are in heresy or not. I don't know which attitude is worse. Subjectively the liberal attitude is far worse; but as to the damage being done to the remnant trying to hold fast, the false traditionalists are doing the greater harm.

The devolution goes further — yes, even among the "traditionalists." Since the 1950s, when the same heresy Archbishop Lefebrve's followers hold was used to condemn Father Feeney, the tendency toward horizontalization and de-Incarnationalization of the economy of Redemption has accelerated into the most outrageous and blasphemous "sincerity" theologies that the demons could have hoped for. In a Church saturated in indifferentism, the Holy Ghost is considered almost universally today to be actively at work inspiring non-believers to be better non-believers, Moslems to be more zealously dedicated to their Koran, Hindus to their Veda books, Jews to their disgusting and blasphemous Talmud, and Buddhists to their pantheistic idolatry. Lutherans are lauded for their faithful devotion to Martin Luther, and Catholics are led by their religious leaders to praise him too, as they do so many other subversive persons and movements. And why not? All roads lead to the same place, as they like to say. True, we would add, with one exception, the Catholic road!

Yes, even our leaders on the right hold these things — and more! More? You mean conservative theologians? No, I mean liberal theologians posing not just as "conservatives," but as the most traditional among the conservatives. Consider Michael

Davies. It would be hard to find more learned and hard-working advocate of the Catholic position on every issue but the one that counts most. Mr. Davies has felt no shame in writing for The Remnant and in his own books that atheists who lead a good moral life can go to heaven. Karl Rahner taught the same thing, only he was smart enough to call such a sincere atheist a Christian at heart, an "anoynimous Christian." Davies doesn't stop here, nor do his sacerdotal friends who comb his writings, for the hard-working writer teaches that the wife of a Hindu who in zeal for religion throws herself upon her husband's funeral pyre performs a holy and virtuous act, meriting the bliss of heaven for such uncompromising conviction. According to this way of thinking the Jews who crucified Our Lord did a good thing, "a service to God," as Jesus had prophesied of their motivation in killing His followers, for they only obeyed conscience. And Saul of Tarsus had no need to become a Saint Paul. He could have been saved just the way he was, for he was very sincere. In fact, some traditionalists argue, and I think Davies says this too, that it would be sinful for someone to act contrary to his conscience. Hence, people as hateful of Christianity as was Saul of Tarsus would sin if they did not work to overthrow it. Who then needs converting? Not the cold who hate, but only the lukewarm. For, after all, it was only these whom Our Lord said He would vomit out of His mouth.

Do you see where such nonsense leads? The best that we can say of sincerity (or its misnomer "good faith") is that it reduces culpability. For the deeds that we do in ignorance, if they are against the will of God, are still to our discredit not to our credit, whether we knew them to be wrong or thought them to be right. "There is a way that seemeth just to a man," says the Book of Proverbs, "but the ends thereof lead to death." (14:12) And, though I cannot put my finger on it at this time, I once read a dissertation on this very subject by Saint Bernard, where he brilliantly attacks the perverse opinion that Saul did well, not ill, in following his erroneous conscience prior to his conversion. Also you will find among the condemned errors of Peter Abelard this supposition that is applicable to the case: "That they have not sinned who being ignorant have crucified Christ, and that whatever is done through ignorance must not be considered as sin." (Denz. 377) For if His murderers had not sinned Christ would have had no need to pray from the Cross for their forgiveness, nor could they be forgiven without repentance as Saint Peter so vividly insists in the second or third chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Nevertheless, Father Williamson, of the St. Pius X Society, assured us that Saint Paul did not sin when he persecuted the Church of Christ, for he did his work out of ignorance, thereby, no doubt, meriting for himself a heavenly reward.

Are you beginning to see why Father Feeney attacked the problem at its source? In an age where theologians no longer believed in the necessity of becoming a Catholic for salvation, the theory of baptism in desire, or "of desire," provided a convenient springboard from which to launch errors leading to heresy. Extreme liberals like Hans Kung, Avery Dulles, and so many others are not being illogical when they write that the Church should be honest and cease its theorizing about how non-Catholics are somehow in the Church as a result of some cute theological gymnastics in semanticism and sophistry. Why doesn't the Church, they say, just come right out and admit the obvious that there is salvation outside the Church? For this "adage," "axiom," "dictum," or whatever you want to call it is sheer hogwash. I am paraphrasing of course. Yet, hogwash, it would be, if the dogma meant what these theoreticians of the last century speculate that it does. At least Cardinal Newman catered to consistency when, after Vatican Council I, in his efforts to minimize the importance of papal infallibility, he argued against this traditional doctrine's parametered and obvious sense by saying that the Popes in the past had defined "ex-cathedra" Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus and they were "obviously" not to be taken literally. Hence, Newman contended, the Pope

cannot be literally infallible everytime he speaks from the Chair on faith or morals. The Cardinal's weak faith, if he even had divine faith, was right on one count — the Popes had intended their definition of the dogma to be taken in a literal sense (or else they hardly would have expressed themselves the way they did). But he was wrong on the other count, the Pope defining is always, in Council or out of Council, infallible.

Allow me to conclude with two quotes and you tell me which of the two illustrious authors quoted believes the salvation doctrine:

> They will propose each dogma, especially the all-important dogma, "out of the Church there is No salvation," in the words of the Church and explain it as she understands it; they are most careful not to weaken in the least the meaning of this great dogma, by the way of proposing or explaining it. Why does not Saint Paul say: if anyone preach to you a Gospel contrary to that instead of beside that which we have preached to you? "It is," says St. John Chrysostom, "to show us that one is accursed who even indirectly weakens the least truth of the Gospel."

> The Church is necessary; the Church is the one ark of salvation; we must state it. That has always been the adage of theology: "Outside the Church there is no Salvation." Is that intolerance? No, it is the teaching of theology, it is the truth. This does not mean that none among other religions may be saved. But none is saved by his erroneous and false religion. If men are saved in Protestantism, Buddhism or Islam, they are saved by the Catholic Church, by the grace of Our Lord, by the prayers of those in the Church, by the Blood of Our Lord as individuals, perhaps through the practice of their religion, perhaps because of what they understand in their religion, but not by their religion, since no one can be saved by error.

The first quote is from perhaps the greatest Scripture scholar of all time, Cornelius a Lapide. It is found in his Commentary on Galatians I:8. A Lapide was thinking with the mind of the Church and all the saints of his day. The second quote is from a sermon given a Rennes, in 1982, by Archbishop Marcel Lefebrve. It speaks for itself. As far as we know the Archbishop has never corrected his error. And his priests continue to preach it and to attack the Catholic doctrine, which is even a clearer sign of a true heretic. However, in the Archbishop's favor, during that same speech he calls to the attention of the audience the "necessity" for missionary evangelization, quoting Our Lord's clear words: "he that believeth not shall be condemned." Why are there so few missionaries after the Council, asks the Archbishop? The answer he gives is "because the definition of the Church has been changed . . . " And then he concludes with this statement that appears so contradictory of what he said above: "There is no longer any need (for missions) if people can be saved within their own religion." Isn't that what Monsignor Lefebrve himself just said was his own view? No wonder people are confused!

Well, Comandante, I have certainly burdened you with a bundle, but I can think of nothing more important to trouble you with. Your zeal for souls and the reformation of the Church will move you, I am sure, to read most carefully what I have written

these past three days. Use it with the other literature you already have and the booklet enclosed. Forgive me for speaking strongly about the Society of Saint Pius X, but we are tired of the scandal their priests are causing, some of whom refuse us Holy Communion for our "heresy." Now, as you can read in their latest issue of the Verbum, they take another stupid swing at us, without knowing anything about our position or the Church's. The only way to stop them is to expose them for the liberals and the inept theologians they are. Unfortunately, no one ever taught them that a wise man is thought the more wise by the prudence he adopts in speaking less and listening more, while there is no greater fool than the stupid man who talks all the time. I do not know how intelligent are these priests who compose treatises against Father Feeney's teaching, but I do know for sure that, if their theology speaks for their mental capability, they would do the Church far greater service in limiting themselves to spiritual exhortation and refraining from commenting about this all-important doctrine until they have educated themselves.

Again I apologize for the tone of this letter, which I would like you to share with whomever you wish. I am far out of character in my indignant comments, but they have been restrained for too long, always out of a spirit of "heelful" submission to the part Our Lady wishes us to play at the bottom of the Mystical Body. But now the heel is hurting and it is going to be shouting louder than ever. I am afraid many things I have said in this letter are very poorly worded. True theology is what the Holy Ghost wants to be said, but my way of saying it does truth little credit. Let us both pray that the veil on the dogma will soon be lifted.

Do let us hear from you soon. Do not be as negligent as I have been in responding. But, as I said at the start, my delay was owed to our eviction.

God bless you. May Our Lady protect you and enlighten you in your apostolate.

Sincerely,
In the Immaculate Heart of Mary

Brother Michael, MICM

Brother Michael, M.I.C.M.

APPENDIX: Quote from Father Migne, as referred to one page 4:

"From among the Catholic Fathers perhaps no one insists more than Ambrose on the absolute necessity of receiving Baptism, in various places, but especially in Book II De Abraham, cap. 11, num. 84; Sermon II In Psal., cxviii, num. 14, and the book De Mysteriis, cap. 4, num. 20" (Patrologiae Latinae, Tomus XVI, S. Ambrosius, pp. 1428-1429, n. 38)